



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1996/718
5 September 1996

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 5 SEPTEMBER 1996 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF
THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA TO THE UNITED NATIONS
ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to transmit here the text of a statement by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea dated 2 September 1996.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) KIM Hyong U
Ambassador
Permanent Representative



Annex

Statement by the spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of
the Democratic People's Republic of Korea dated 2 September 1996

Fifty-one years have elapsed since the military occupation of south Korea by the United States.

Over half a century of occupation of south Korea by United States military forces has created the tragedy of a divided nation, put grave obstacles in the way of peace and reunification of the Korean peninsula, even in the current post-cold war era, and inflicted immeasurable misery and suffering on the entire Korean population.

Had it not been for the occupation of south Korea by United States military forces, our fatherland would not have suffered the disastrous three-year war in the early 1950s and the situation of today's Korean peninsula, characterized by confrontation, war and division, would not have developed.

The continued presence of United States forces in south Korea is totally responsible for the failure of an atmosphere of trust to be established between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States owing to the persistent belligerence and deeply rooted hostile relations that still remain in place between the two countries.

The occupation of south Korea by United States military forces is not an issue of concern confined to the Korean nation only. The United States military presence is, to a large extent, related to the still lingering after-effect of the cold war era in north-east Asia today that places the peace and security of this region in heavy uncertainty. These facts clearly prove that the United States military occupation of south Korea should not continue any longer.

As a matter of fact, at present, there is no justification whatsoever for United States military forces to remain stationed in south Korea.

The north and south of Korea signed and put into effect the inter-Korean agreement as early as February 1992, pledging non-aggression, and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States signed the Agreed Framework in 1994, pledging to resolve the nuclear issue, to normalize their political and economic relations and to work together towards peace and security.

Moreover, since the cold war era structure of East-West confrontation has been dissolved and those countries that were once enemies of the United States are now becoming close friendly partners of the United States, developments in north-east Asia no longer provide any justification for the United States military presence in the region. It follows, therefore, that it is high time for the United States to make a bold decision to withdraw its military forces from south Korea and that, indeed, it is the best point of time for its "honourable withdrawal".

The above notwithstanding, the United States continues to keep its military forces stationed in south Korea and is reluctant to declare its intention to withdraw its military forces therefrom.

To the contrary, the United States is further heightening its military threat, blackmail and pressure against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and stirring up confrontation and an arms race among the countries of the region by modernizing the weaponry and military equipment of United States forces in south Korea and further increasing military exercises between the United States and south Korea, and the United States and Japan. Such United States policy is anachronistic and runs counter to the demands of our people and the peoples of the Asia-Pacific region.

The best way for a peaceful solution to the issues in the Korean peninsula, which still remains the last vestige of the cold war era, is to eliminate the outdated armistice system emanating from the end of the Korean War and to establish as early as possible a new peace mechanism to replace the old system.

On the basis of such practical requirements, the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea made a constructive proposal in April 1994, calling for the establishment of a new peace mechanism, a proposal that was followed in February 1996 by a further expanded peace proposal, calling for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States to conclude an interim agreement replacing the Armistice Agreement, pending a full peace agreement between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the United States, and to establish a joint military body to implement and supervise the implementation of the proposed interim agreement.

This proposal of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is motivated by its serious desire and consideration that, if the United States finds it inconvenient to discuss the establishment of a comprehensive peace system at the present time, both sides could discuss mutually acceptable steps to deter accidents and armed conflicts as the priority agenda.

However, in an effort to offset the interim agreement proposal of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the United States has come up with the "four-party talks", which are both equivocal in outline and impossible to determine when they will be feasible.

In its "Cheju Island declaration" dated 16 April 1996, the United States said that the "four-party talks" are intended to "initiate the process of a permanent peace agreement". If this is true, the key topic of the proposed talks should be the withdrawal of United States troops. However, it is not yet certain whether the United States side is prepared to discuss the withdrawal of United States military forces from south Korea at the talks or whether such a titular proposal was put forward in order to reject our proposal. The United States will have to clarify its position on this point.

If the United States side is not willing to discuss the immediate withdrawal of its military forces from south Korea at the "four-party talks", it is only too self-evident that such a formula of talks is utterly useless.

/...

S/1996/718
English
Page 4

We believe that, on all accounts, a positive United States response at this time to our interim agreement proposal meets United States interests as well.

We will follow the future attitude of the United States.
